

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_83569
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of various organics substrates and evolution of chemical parameters during composting of Panicum maximum jacq and Oriza sativa L. straw
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The overall presentation is nice. However, there are some improvements are suggested: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please add a line representing your specific methodology in your Abstract section2. There are so many uncited statements in the introduction section3. We didn't find a specific research question in the introduction section4. Please add a flow chart in your methodology section5. Please add a Photograph/schematic diagram in the Methodology Section6. Please add standard deviation to validate statistically the data you provide in results section (Table 1,2, 3 and 4)7. The discussion to explain the results are naot enough, please add more.8. The manuscript lacks of Graphical presentation. No graph has been presented based on the experimental data. Please at least 2 graphs based on the data obtained from the experimental work. Besides, explain these graphs in the text.9. Please update all the citations with recent studies10. Please polish the English language of the manuscript.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The correction was made.2. An improvement was made3. A specific research question was added4. An experimental conceptual framework was added5. Images were added to better illustrate the concepts explained6. Standard deviations were added to all results tables (Tables 2,3, 4 and 5).7. The Discussion section was completely rewritten with new references to more effectively put our results into context.8. We chose to present our results using tables. This has enabled us to provide a clear depiction of the values we obtained for the variables and parameters we measured. We feel that if we changed these tables to graphs, there would be an overload or superfluity of information presented in the body of the paper.9. Newer, more recent references were added to the manuscript. However, for the Materials and Methods sections, it would be difficult to change the references, because they refer to standard laboratory protocols that we used for our analyses and that were published some time ago.10. The entire manuscript was thoroughly revised to improve the quality of English language expression.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	